

amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 9090. A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9091. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by providing for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure the coherent development of all official international cultural activities of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCGINLEY:

H.R. 9092. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.R. 9093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund to States of certain taxes on distilled spirits and wine destroyed by fire, casualty, or act of God; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9094. A bill to establish the U.S. Study Commission on the Development of the Rivers, Ports, and Drainage Basins (and intervening areas) of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9095. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 9096. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9097. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal field service required to qualify on scheme

examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 9098. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9099. A bill to save and preserve for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9100. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 9101. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 9102. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 9103. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 9104. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 9105. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennes-

see Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 519. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to enable the Congress to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9106. A bill for the relief of John E. Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H.R. 9107. A bill for the relief of Joseph Maz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 9108. A bill for the relief of Frank De Nardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9109. A bill for the relief of Elio Tapparelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 9110. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9111. A bill for the relief of Amalia Sandel Malachowski and her minor child, Barbara Sandel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 9112. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fannie A. Dablias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 9113. A bill for the relief of Mihaly Matrai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 9114. A bill for the relief of Wallace Edward Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Crab and Oyster Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, canned crabmeat and canned oyster imports from Japan are increasing at an alarming rate and threaten the prosperity and employment in the Pacific coast shellfish industry.

In the first 6 months of 1959 canned crabmeat imports from Japan totaled 4,289,000 pounds compared to 2,739,000 in the same period of the preceding year. This is an increase of 56 percent.

Canned oyster imports from Japan for the first 6 months of 1959 were 2,600,000 pounds compared to 1,853,000 pounds in the same 6 months of 1958 or an increase of 40 percent.

I have written to Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, urging that his committee this fall investigate the impact of these in-

creasing canned shellfish imports upon the prosperity and employment in the American shellfish industry and to make recommendations to Congress as to the most effective way to protect the domestic industry against damage.

Convention of the Ukrainian American Youth Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to greet the Ukrainian American Youth Association which is about to hold a convention marking the 10th year of the existence of this great organization. Some 8,000 delegates will shortly meet simultaneously at Spring Glen, N.Y., and in Detroit, Mich. They deserve our good wishes, our encouragement, and our applause. It is events such as these which

lend inspiration to the whole movement and which give them the courage to continue their dedication to freedom and independence.

To descendants of the people of the Ukraine the battle against Russian imperialism is no new event. They have struggled against Russian tyranny for 300 years. Indeed, their forthcoming convention heralds the 300th anniversary of the triumphant victory of the Ukrainian Army against the Russians at Konotop, and the 250th anniversary of their tragic defeat by the Russian Army at Poltava. The Ukrainian-American knows perhaps better than any of us the threat and the danger of Russian aggression, because they have fought it when it bore the flag of the Czar, and continue to fight it when it carries the flag of the hammer and sickle. Their persistent spirit and dedication to the cause of freedom should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

I want to especially congratulate those members of my district who will be among those attending this fine and praiseworthy convention. They make up an important segment of the Ukrainian Youth Association. Their voices will be strong in the forthcoming proceedings.

I deeply regret my inability to attend and participate in this event, as I have on numerous occasions in the past. I will be with them in spirit, as I think all of us will be, and I wish them success and fulfillment in their great endeavors.

Lafayette-Marne Day, September 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Marquis de Lafayette, whose 202d birth anniversary falls on September 6, was the hero of two continents, the pride of two nations struggling for democracy and freedom.

He was born in 1757 in a chateau in Auvergne, France, and at the time of his death, in 1834, his name had become a household name both in France and in America.

This gallant and gifted son of France, who, in the course of our War of Independence, rendered invaluable services and thereby earned the everlasting gratitude of the American people, was a remarkable man in many ways. In mid-1777, when he asked for and received a commission of major general, the highest rank after the commander in chief, he had not passed his 20th birthday. The youthful and precocious soldier of freedom quickly acquitted himself most honorably on the battlefield. As a resourceful leader and first-rate tactician, his abilities were fully appreciated by Washington.

When his military career in this country came to an end after the Battle of Yorktown he returned to France. There he was made a major general in the French Army in 1781. Later he found himself in the very center of the French Revolution. In 1787 he became a member of the Assembly of Notables, and some time before the Revolution he urged the King to convoke the States-General. During the Revolution he constantly pleaded for personal freedom—for the abolition of arbitrary imprisonment, for religious tolerance, for popular representation, and for the establishment of trial by jury. He was rebuffed by many of the violently Revolutionary leaders. He was sadly disappointed with the course of the Revolution.

For a while he had to flee France, and lived in retirement. In 1824 he revisited the United States at the invitation of President Monroe. Here he was overwhelmed with popular applause, and the Congress voted him the sum of \$200,000. He gratefully accepted the gift, returned to his native land. He died on May 20, 1834.

Today in honoring the memory of this great soldier of freedom on his 202d anniversary, we also observe another event falling on the same date, September 6, that is, Marne Day, marking the first battle of the Marne which began

45 years ago early in the First World War and continued for the next 3 days. That battle has often been described as the turning point in that war. By participating in that world struggle and thus insuring the conclusion of that war in favor of democratic forces, we also repaid some of the debt to France which America had incurred at the time of our War of Independence.

In expressing our gratitude for General Lafayette's signal services to this country, and also in expressing our profound admiration for the gallant French soldiers who almost alone fought successfully in the first Battle of the Marne, we pay our respect to their blessed memory.

The Situation in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me with respect to the situation in Laos. The statement calls for renewed efforts for the establishment of a United Nations police force.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

The morning radio reports that the Government of Laos has asked the help of the United Nations in curbing the invading Communist forces calls for immediate action by the United States and the U.N. This is a legitimate request of a duly constituted government which is being victimized by outside aggression, and the free world cannot ignore it. No matter how much Peking and Moscow may proclaim their innocence, the machinations of the international Communist conspiracy are clearly evident in the events in Laos.

I hope the United States will see its way clear to send further aid to the people of Laos in this crisis. I hope, in addition, that the wheels will begin to turn within the United Nations for the creation of a permanent international army which can deal with nibbling Communist aggression such as this. I am today writing to the President urging him to instruct the Secretary of State and our Ambassador to the United Nations to press for positive steps by the U.N. for the establishment of an international police force. Perhaps the crisis in Laos can serve as the spur needed for the U.N. to take this essential step to the building of lasting peace.

One of the most tragic aspects of the request of the Laos Government for U.N. help is that the U.N. does not have any kind of police force which can be rushed into the breach. There is no international army primed for instant action when such conflagrations break out around the world.

It is true, of course, that there is a splendid precedent for using a U.N. group as a buffer between warring states. The special U.N. Emergency Force has wrought miracles in patrolling the Israeli-Egyptian border in the wake of the conflict there. It has provided the cushion which was needed to keep the protagonists apart and promote stability in an area of acute tension.

It is my firm conviction there has been sufficient study and experience concerning a United Nations police force. There is plenty of evidence to show how great a factor it could be in preserving peace. No nation of good will can in good conscience oppose the creation of such a group.

Indeed, I believe we would have every right to question the motives of any nation which would oppose this essential step toward establishing a firm and lasting peace. The United States has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to participate in an international army for peace and its resolve has been bolstered by resolutions adopted by the Congress.

Certainly, outbreaks of aggression such as we have witnessed in recent years in Korea, Hungary, various places in the Middle East and Far East, and now in Laos, make an international army an imperative the world can ill afford to ignore any longer.

It should, of course, be under the control of the United Nations, ready to move instantly in case of an international emergency at the request of a member government which believes itself threatened by outside aggression or subversion directed by another country.

In a world contracted by speedy communications and transportation, in a world in which so many nations possess the terribly destructive weapons of modern warfare, any international conflict—no matter how localized—can spread like wildfire and thus present a real threat to world stability. The only feasible answer to this challenge to the peace of the world is a U.N. force capable of so spreading an international mantle over an embattled area as to inhibit—if not directly to prevent the spreading of any local conflict.

A U.N. police force need not be a huge, all-powerful army. It might not number more than 50,000 or 60,000. It might perhaps be best to establish a firm nucleus at all times centered under one command, with other forces in the individual countries available upon call.

The smaller nations should form the backbone of this international group. This will prevent the bigger powers running the risk of being dragged into a nuclear conflict which could doom all mankind.

Such an international army could not—and should not—fight wars. But it could serve as an effective deterrent to hostilities, could be a focus for the moral opinion of the world, and could serve numerous practical buffer uses in observation, patrol, and guard duty between hostile states.

Because of the dangers inherent in man's vast technological and material progress, because of the repeatedly demonstrated determination of some powers to stir up trouble at every opportunity, we must search with imagination and foresight for the answers to the enigmas of world peace. Today we have too little of either—at a time when we stand in desperate need of both.

Time is running short. Each new crisis brings us closer to the potential horrors of world war III. The next international brush fire may set off that world conflagration if the nations of the world do not rise to the occasion.

A permanent United Nations police force provides a new, decisive means by which the nations of the world which sincerely believe in peace can provide the machinery to quarantine regional conflicts and Communist military probes, and thus better insure their solution. It would be fitting for the United States, with its demonstrated dedication to creating a peace based on justice and morality, and with its repeatedly affirmed belief in the United Nations, to take the lead in this great task.

In the meantime, I am extremely hopeful our Government will do everything possible to give aid and comfort to the embattled

Government of Laos. I hope steps can be taken within the U.N. to establish a temporary, emergency police unit to come to the aid of that nation as it attempts to resist the Communist. I hope ways and means will be found to send additional American aid to Laos. Clearly, the United States and the free world cannot stand idly by while Laos is engulfed in the tide of the international Communist conspiracy.

Ill-Considered Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news report that I have sent to my constituents in the 11th Congressional District of Michigan:

Much has been written and said during the last few weeks about labor reform legislation, especially the Landrum-Griffin bill. I have received hundreds of letters, telegrams, and post cards on this subject from all parts of the Nation. None of these contained a threatening tenor, except for the form letter I have received from James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers. So that my constituents may be informed in this matter, I am including a copy of his letter and setting out my reply to him. His threatening communication is a reflection on the citizens of the United States and an un-American attempt to intimidate the Congress of the United States.

AUGUST 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY, President.

AUGUST 21, 1959.

DEAR MR. CAREY: I have received your form letter of August 18 endeavoring to intimidate me because of my favorable vote on August 12, 1959, in support of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which also was supported by President Eisenhower as well as by 303 of my colleagues

of the total membership of 426 in the House of Representatives.

It is interesting to note that you have described this legislation as "a punitive and repressive measure." This phrase characterizes the tenor of your letter. In my judgment your action constitutes a grave and intemperate misuse of the money of the rank and file of labor union members. By your ill-considered threat you are exposing the labor boss practice of the denial of the basic rights and democratic processes of your union members. A threat from you is no more terrifying to me than would be a threat from Mr. Hoffa, although I believe even he would be inclined to use better judgment than you have demonstrated.

By your act you have caused me to realize more than ever that I was correct in voting for the Landrum-Griffin bill. I am sure my voting record has proven to my constituency that I am interested in individual rights and democracy more than in the concentration of power in the hands of big business, regardless of whether that big business be the management boss or the labor boss.

The people of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan will not yield to the unthinking dudgeon of any labor leader when they are exercising the right to mark their ballot in secret for the candidates of their choice. Similarly, I would not, and did not yield to any pressures from the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce, as you allege, when I cast my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

I have always supported legislation that would protect the rights of labor union members and would rid the unions of the practices of corruption, breach of trust, gangsterism, violence, and abuses of power. The political hoodlumism that you imply will be brought to bear against me does not dismay me, and I am sure it will not be persuasive with the thinking people of my congressional district.

In order that my constituency may be aware of your activities I am sending a copy of your letter and my reply to all individuals on my mailing list. I respect the intelligence of the people whom I have the honor to represent, and know that they too will realize more than ever the real need for the enactment of the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Yours truly,

VICTOR A. KNOX,
Member of Congress.

Settlement of Bethlehem Steel Co. Dispute With Shipbuilding Workers Is Vital to Our Country's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] has done the Members of the House of Representatives and the public a signal service by forcefully calling to our attention the present stalemate in contract negotiations between the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

It has been pointed out that the Bethlehem Steel Co. operates 8 shipyards along the Atlantic coast employing some 17,000 men who represent the core of

shipbuilding know-how in the eastern United States. One of these yards is located in my district at Sparrows Point, Md., and I, personally, know many of the men employed there who have devoted their entire lives to the shipbuilding industry. The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO, is one of the country's most highly respected unions. Its members have proved time and again that they are willing to place our country's strength and well-being above their own economic interest.

The union's contract with Bethlehem Steel expired on July 31, 1959. Prior to that time the union's representatives had begun efforts to negotiate a new collective bargaining agreement with the company. The company has presented the union with demands that the union simply could not accept. Principal among these demands is the threatened elimination of the seniority rights of many highly skilled craftsmen.

I believe that the shipyard workers have given strong evidence of their desire to bargain in good faith. They have proposed that the expired agreement be extended for a brief period in order that negotiations could continue. This offer was refused by the company. The union then offered to submit both the company's demands and the union's proposals to arbitration. This offer was also rejected by the company. The union members have further shown their good faith by continuing on the job despite the fact they do not have a contract.

This is particularly significant because in many of its yards Bethlehem shipbuilding is engaged in vitally important work for the U.S. Navy. At this time Bethlehem shipyards are building the nuclear missile carrier *Long Beach* and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge*. At the same time one of its yards is converting the missile firing cruiser *Springfield*. We simply cannot afford to lose any more ground in our efforts to match and surpass the growing Soviet military machine.

I call upon both labor and management to join in full and open collective bargaining in keeping with our established tradition of fair play. It has been suggested that the House Armed Services Committee's subcommittee on defense activities conduct an immediate factfinding investigation. There is ample precedent for this step because the same subcommittee investigated a similar situation in 1954. The previous investigation produced favorable results and should the present situation continue, I, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, will support the request for committee action.

I am further concerned by this situation because recently two of our Atlantic coast shipbuilding concerns lost sizable contracts to California shipbuilders. These contracts were lost because of an unfair and artificial 6 percent advantage given California firms by an archaic section of the Merchant Marine Act. I have introduced H.R. 8176, which will repeal this unfair clause. If the east coast firms are to compete successfully with other areas, with or without this

unfair advantage presently enjoyed by some, we must have fair and stable labor-management relations.

We must also consider the absolute necessity of maintaining our pool of highly skilled and experienced shipyard workers. The collective know-how of these men is vital to our national security. The dissipation and eventual loss of these special skills could have a far-reaching effect on our country's ability to produce today's nuclear vessels.

Glittering Generalities Courtesy of A.T. & T.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last month I read with interest a full-page advertisement which the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. placed in Life magazine August 3. It was entitled "Why in Heaven Don't You Speak Out on Inflation?"

Naturally I was interested. I estimate that millions of readers saw that appeal.

I believe this ad is part of a campaign being waged by big business as a part of the antediluvian thinking of the Republican Party. I have replied to other such ads and I have sent copies to the Bureau of Internal Revenue to see if they are legitimately paid for as a business expense.

Now no one is against a strong, sound, and stable dollar.

No one likes unreasonable demands.

No one approves excessive spending.

Neither do we approve of child beating or the kicking of dogs.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that this ad, like too many appearing in newspapers and magazines these days, deals with glittering generalities. The vague proposal or statement is a favorite weapon of Madison Avenue.

I have written to the president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, to offer some comments about his company's participation in what appears to be a big phony anti-inflation campaign.

The advertisement and my letter to Mr. Kappel follow.

AN INTERESTING LETTER SAID, "WHY IN HEAVEN DON'T YOU SPEAK OUT ON INFLATION?"

I have received a number of letters from men and women who are concerned about inflation. One A.T. & T. shareowner asked, "Why in heaven don't you speak out on this subject?"

The letter went on to say, "If you would alert the 1,625,000 shareowners and 700,000 employees to the facts about inflation, they would help spread the news."

I warmly agree that it is essential to alert more people to the dangers of inflation and we in the Bell System are speaking up and speaking out at every opportunity.

In recent articles and bulletins to employees, the Bell System companies have discussed the threat which inflation poses

to the purchasing power of the dollar and to savings, insurance, and pensions.

At the annual meeting of A.T. & T. shareowners I pointed out that inflation has been a tough problem in the telephone business. But we have not just talked about the problem—we have developed more efficient equipment and introduced many economies of operation. It is worth noting that the price of telephone service generally has gone up less since World War II than most other things.

But we know that the forces of inflation are far too widespread and powerful for any one individual or business to stem them singlehanded.

This brings me to the question that I believe so many are asking: "How can I help?" In these ways, it seems to me:

By giving spoken and written support to those who are working for a strong, sound, and stable dollar.

By opposing unreasonable demands, excessive spending, and schemes that add fuel to the inflationary fire.

Your friends and associates, and especially your representatives in Congress, are entitled to your constructive views.

For our part, we will continue to fight inflation by pushing research hard and effecting economies in our business. And by speaking out against this threat to the people and the country.

FREDERICK R. KAPPEL,
President, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.,
New York, N.Y.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., Sept. 3, 1959.

Mr. FREDERICK R. KAPPEL,
President, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAPPEL: Your full-page advertisement in the August 3 issue of Life magazine, entitled "Why in Heaven Don't You Speak Out on Inflation?" appears to be part of a concerted effort by big business corporations to influence public policy through paid ads in national magazines.

As I read your advertisement I could not help but reflect that you must have a pretty poor opinion of the intelligence of the American people to think that they could be influenced by so vacuous a statement. You are for a strong, sound, and stable dollar. So are we all. What specifically, then, is it that you would have us speak out against?

You urge the public to oppose unreasonable demands. But what the unreasonable demands are that should be opposed you do not tell us. Has it occurred to you that many of the readers of the advertisement might regard putting pressure upon governmental regulatory agencies to establish rates that add considerably to the cost of telephone service as falling into the category of unreasonable demands? And, you know, rate hikes are also inflationary.

The recent order of the Federal Communications Commission, cutting long-distance telephone rates by \$50 million a year, would seem to indicate that if you were genuinely concerned about containing the forces of inflation you would make every effort to achieve a downward revision of the toll charges to your customers without putting the Government into position of having to do it for you.

Your urge us to oppose excessive spending. Here again you are deliberately vague. Surely, it is not your intention that the consumer should curtail his expenditures for telephone services. I presume that what you do have in mind is the reduction of governmental expenditures. Shall we curtail outlays for national defense, foreign aid, highways, schools, etc.? Shall the letters which you urge the public to write aim to support those Members in Congress who wish to

maintain a lid on interest rates so as to keep down the cost of servicing the Government debt? Unfortunately, you furnish us with no guidance. Certainly you would want us to be discriminating. Otherwise the public might end up by unwittingly urging the adoption of proposals advanced by the Democratic Party rather than those advocated by the Republican administration, in support of which you are using the funds of the A.T. & T. for paid advertisements.

What we need from business leadership is more enlightenment rather than obfuscation, less of an appeal to the emotions and more to the rational consideration of great national issues. Madison Avenue techniques for getting people to purchase commodities are hardly the tools for promoting understanding and for arriving at intelligent decisions in matters of public policy.

As one of the largest business corporations in America, the A.T. & T. has joined the ranks of what is essentially an anti-democratic movement among certain top business leaders who are determined to employ the funds of their corporations for the purpose of influencing public opinion. Have you ascertained how many of your 1,625,000 shareholders would endorse your campaign to frighten Americans about inflation? I am certain that there are a great many stockholders who do not share your views on political and economic issues. They would, of course, not question your right as a private citizen to publicly express your views. But it is another matter when you use the name and funds of your company to foist on the public your personal opinions as to current events. The taxpayer has also a right to be aggrieved when these paid advertisements are charged off as a corporate expense.

You must have noticed, Mr. Kappel, that 2 weeks after you felt compelled through your advertisement to alert the American people on the threat of inflation, the second report of what is popularly known as the Nixon Anti-Inflation Committee was released. In contrast to the first report, issued only 7 weeks earlier, which stated that "our economy is now at a critical juncture urgently requiring action to forestall inflation," the second one contained no warning about the imminence of inflation. In the words of Business Week (Aug. 22), the former bristled with a sense of crisis with respect to inflation, while the latter was described as playing down inflation talk, with greater attention given to economic growth. This suggests that before you commit yourself to another full-page advertisement you had better check with the Vice President as to what is the latest official line. In that way you might get the maximum benefit out of your advertising expenditures.

May I remind you, Mr. Kappel, that during the past year when the administration was clamoring vociferously that inflation was so pressing and immediate a threat, fellow legislators with whose thinking I agree have pointed out that there was little basis in fact to support the administration's claims; that the Consumer Price Index had remained more or less at a constant level throughout the year; that most of the increases in the price level had occurred during and shortly after wars, when too many dollars were chasing too few goods; and that in view of our great responsibilities as the leading nation of the free world and of our neglected needs at home, it was imperative that the administration concentrate its efforts on promoting the acceleration of the American rate of economic growth.

I can only draw one conclusion from the anti-inflation campaign. The term "inflation" has come to be a slogan employed by conservative elements to defeat any legislation which they look upon with disfavor. It is a weapon used to frighten us away from measures designed to improve the lot of the common man through programs for

the removal of slum and blighted areas, for strengthening our school systems, and for expenditures on much needed public services and facilities. It also has had the unfortunate result of taking dangerous risks with the future of our national security through inadequate support of much needed defense expenditures.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Report of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me with respect to the report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

The report of the Commission on Civil Rights, although not yet officially released, already has stirred violent verbal blasts from some quarters. This reaction is not unexpected since the work of the Commission has been subjected to obstruction by its opponents from its very inception. It is obvious that there are some people who do not want the facts with regard to civil rights to be studied and discussed. These people are determined to leave no stone unturned in their conspiracy to prevent information on these vital issues from reaching the American people.

I have reviewed the report of the Civil Rights Commission with great interest. It is a balanced, well-documented analysis of the legal and moral problems in the way of realizing equality under the law in accordance with our democratic tradition. These problems are not sectional or partisan. They should be of concern to all Americans throughout the country who respect the Constitution.

I can well understand some differences of opinion with regard to the specific recommendations of the Commission. I cannot, however, condone the blanket condemnation and venom which have already been heaped upon its work by its diehard opponents. Nor can I sympathize with any effort to prevent Americans from exercising their sacred right to vote or from enjoying the same privileges under our laws regardless of their race, creed or national origin.

In my opinion, the Commission's recommendations for the most part are very moderate. Its first recommendation, for example, is that the Bureau of the Census be authorized and directed to undertake a nationwide compilation of registration and voting statistics. I thought we in this country had long passed the day when we would consider such statistic-gathering activities by the Bureau of the Census as un-American. The Commission also recommends that voting records shall be preserved and be made public provided that all care is taken to preserve the secrecy of the ballot. This seems to me to be an eminently reasonable pro-

posal. There also are recommendations with respect to appointment of temporary Federal registrars, for prosecution of persons who under color of law deprive individuals of an opportunity to register and vote, and for the enforcement of the Commission's present subpoena powers, which would certainly deserve Congress' support. The only dissent from any of these recommendations is by Commissioner Battle, the former Governor of Virginia. The other Commissioners, Chairman Hannah, president of Michigan State University; Robert Storey, the dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School; Doyle Carlton, former Governor of Florida; Father Hesburgh, the president of the University of Notre Dame; and George M. Johnson, former dean of the Howard University School of Law; were unanimous in their support of these proposals.

The Commission's report deals with housing and education as well as with voting rights and, of course, there are some differences among the various Commissioners with respect to specific proposals made in these fields. This in no way serves to undermine the importance of the Commission's report. Rather, it serves to emphasize the necessity for continuing the great work in which these men are engaged so that further light can be shed on the many difficult issues which are faced in the field of civil rights. These men, all of them distinguished Americans, are engaged in a great dialogue on a subject which goes to the core of our American way of life. Discussions and reports can pave the way for an era of ever-increasing freedom and liberty for all Americans. It has always been my creed that no American can feel secure in his freedom unless the freedom of all Americans is safeguarded. This appears also to be the dominant theme of the Commission's report. I applaud the results the Commission has thus far accomplished. Under no circumstances should we even consider adjournment until the authority for continuation of the Commission has been assured.

The Federal Government Can Save Tax Dollars—Move Its Operations to Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week the proposal to reduce appropriations for schools in federally impacted areas was rejected by a House Education and Labor Subcommittee. The decision was disappointing to supporters of the administration's program to cut down on unnecessary spending. It was another blatant refusal to take a stand against inflationary practices.

The recommendations of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were modest enough, with the principal item providing for a 50-percent decrease in aid to school districts where parents of students work for the Government in another jurisdiction. A district in point is Montgomery County, Md., the residence of many men and women who are employed by the Federal

Government in the District of Columbia. Montgomery County, which prides itself as one of the wealthiest—if not the wealthiest—counties in the United States, comes in for a handout of about \$3 million this year under Public Law 874, which one of the laws the administration sought to modify in the interest of economy.

The total cost of the prevailing program amounts to \$225 million annually, with beneficiaries including numerous school districts serving permanent military bases. Under the administration plan, appropriations would have been reduced by almost 30 percent the first year, with additional savings scheduled for succeeding years. At a time when the general public is alarmed at the high cost of Government that is constantly reducing purchasing power of the wage earner's dollar, it is extremely unfortunate that an opportunity to save more than \$60 million annually was dismissed by the subcommittee. Yet it is encouraging that members considering the amendments submitted this observation in their report:

It is the feeling of the subcommittee that certain modifications of these programs may be desirable.

For that reason, the subcommittee plans to take up the question again early in the next session with the intention of making specific recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm hope that the subcommittee will in its wisdom make a complete reevaluation of the impacted area gratuities in order that the taxpayer public may at long last obtain relief from the current imposition on the Federal Treasury. Meanwhile, Congress can make a distinct contribution to the cause of economy if demands of local citizens are determined before sites for further Government installations are selected.

As Representative of the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I should like to invite my colleagues to inspect the advantages of Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana Counties as locales for military bases and Federal offices. Although our per capita income cannot be compared with that of Montgomery County, we should be happy to provide the necessary school facilities for children of Government workers if they are located in our district. We resent having to contribute to the education of students in communities that have pleaded for Government construction and then insist on subsidies to provide for normal services and facilities.

If Montgomery County cannot afford to pay for its own schools, give us some of the new Government offices that are contemplated for the future. We would appreciate the employment opportunities and steady paychecks that come with them. In our part of the country we have thousands of men and women wholly competent of serving in whatever capacities are needed. They will welcome the economic stimulation which Government payrolls provide, and in turn they will meet whatever tax assessments are necessary to maintain our schools.

The 22d Congressional District has ample space, excellent transportation facilities, and a climate far superior to that of Montgomery County. I suggest that Congress consider these advantages before deciding upon further new construction. We would be happy to be classified as a federally impacted area without permitting our school system to become a public charge.

Reciprocal Treatment for Tariff Concessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit that orderly foreign commerce conducted on a basis of reciprocity and mutual trust is a goal worth striving for, and I would suggest to the State Department that one way to achieve this worthy objective would be for the United States to insist on reciprocal treatment for every tariff concession granted by our negotiators.

Perhaps we have a right to hope that the State Department will recognize the merits of this policy in time for the next big tariff bargaining festival to be held under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1961.

The adoption of such a policy, however, would mark a sharp departure from our present practice of tariff giveaways, a procedure to which our diplomats have clung through thick and thin for a quarter of a century. Time after time they have successfully resisted the efforts of embattled American producers and jobholders to encourage real reciprocity in our international commerce.

Another instance of this one-sided give-and-take—we give and they take—came to light this week in the pages of two different newspapers.

The New York Times, long-time advocate of freer trade, reported the tremendous boom in the transistor radio industry in Japan. Exports this year will be more than doubled over 1958, the Times disclosed, and no less than 60 percent of the 4 million transistor sets to be shipped abroad by the Japanese will land in the United States.

Japan's next biggest customer will receive 10 percent of total exports, or about one-sixth as many as are crowded into the U.S. market.

That is half of the story. The other half appears on the pages of the Journal of Commerce, another booster of freer trade. There we learn that the United States plans to talk once again with the Japanese about their discrimination against goods from the dollar area.

The press report goes on to list those products from the dollar area that are denied automatic import license approval. The 10 items on the list include

lard, cattle, hides, beef tallow, soy beans, pig iron, and steel, and copper scrap.

Besides that, says the news story, the Japanese discriminate against automobiles made in the United States in favor of small cars manufactured in Europe.

This, of course, illustrates only a single instance of bogus reciprocity in our foreign trade. There are numerous others everywhere we look. The British Prime Minister, in a televised conversation with the President of the United States, appealed for more lenient treatment of British woolen imports, implying to millions of viewers that the United States had quite a way to go to match Britain's liberal trade outlook.

The Prime Minister did not say "ease up on our woolens and we will ease up on your automobiles or electrical equipment." He did not suggest "give our woolen manufacturers a break and we will liberalize our token import plan." In short, he did not say "give us something and we will give you something in return." Not at all. He simply said, politely, "give us something."

Australia offers another case study of bogus reciprocity in action.

In 2 years, 1956 to 1958, the Australians increased their shipments of mutton to the American market by thirtyfold—from a trifle more than 300,000 pounds to more than 14 million pounds. And in the first 6 months of 1959 these imports jumped to 23 million pounds.

Two years ago Australia sent us less than 6 million pounds of beef and veal. Last year these shipments reached 17 million pounds, and in the first half of 1959, they rose to a staggering 83 million pounds.

But what is happening in Australia's domestic market? One development of certain interest to American industry is the appeal of Australian producers of internal combustion engines for a protective tariff.

Engines and engine parts, it seems, are the only parts of motor vehicles which are not now favored by import duties. Australian producers are anxious to remedy this alleged defect. They want a 42½ percent tariff on imported engines and engine parts—but that would apply only to the United States and other countries outside of the Commonwealth preferential tariff system. Nations inside the Commonwealth family would only have to pay a 35 percent tariff to place their engines in the Australian market.

No one knows better than those who recognize its false implications what an effective word "reciprocal" really is. It is rich in meaning; it raises powerful images of faith and trust and mutual responsibility; it is the Golden Rule at work in international relations.

And, sad to say, it represents a picture of foreign trade as illusory, as misleading, as unfair to American industry and labor, as if the entire issue had been distorted and sentimentalized and glamorized in a Hollywood scenario.

Our Government is now making preparations to take part in the next multilateral tariff conference to be sponsored by GATT.

By preparing to take part, I mean specifically that the Government is scanning American industry for products on which to offer new tariff concessions. Experts in the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Tariff Commission, and other agencies are working to put together our country's official bargaining list—some choose to call it, on the basis of painful past experience, the sacrificial offering list.

Nevertheless, this is a highly appropriate time to urge those who are responsible for these negotiations, as well as for the preparatory research that is already underway, to spend some time reexamining this question of reciprocity.

A bargaining list is one thing; what our negotiators do with it when they sit down with representatives of other nations is something else. As long as we have committed ourselves to the disadvantages of multilateral negotiation, let us try to make the best of it. Let our negotiators insist on payment in kind; for one thing, let us stop extending outright tariff reductions in return for somebody else's promise that they will not raise their tariffs on our products.

In my opinion, this practice of granting tariff concessions in return for the other fellow's agreement to stand pat is tantamount to saying, "We will give you something if you promise not to take something away from us that we already have." It is like giving away your car in order to persuade the other fellow not to raise the price of the house he is going to sell you.

Yet, this is exactly what we have done in previous negotiations. Perhaps we have learned our lesson. For the sake of our American economy, I most certainly hope so.

Law Enforcement Officers Deserve Better Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered before the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association at Knoxville on August 28, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to be back here in Knoxville this evening and to discuss a subject of utmost concern to you as law enforcement officers, to me as a legislator, and to all Americans as responsible citizens.

Crime is a cancer that destroys the minds and the souls of its practitioners and extorts severe penalties from all of us.

Approximately 3 million crimes will be committed in the United States this year. In order to meet this menace about \$22 billion will be spent by local and Federal law

enforcement agents. That's more than half the amount that this Nation will spend this year for our national defense. It is 140 times the amount that has been asked by the administration to implement the National Education Defense Act. For every dollar that is contributed to our churches 10 will be spent to combat crime. From a tax standpoint \$22 billion cost every citizen \$128.

These startling financial figures do not represent the greatest expense that crime inflicts. Most serious of all is the loss in human resources, the corruption of our youth, the weakening of our moral fiber.

When we are locked in a global struggle that threatens our ideals and ideas we cannot afford to see our future strength sapped by the corruption of our youth. I am sure you are well aware of our juvenile delinquency problem and the central part it plays in the whole crime movement. During 1959 more than 1 million young people will get in trouble with the police. More than 50 percent of all those arrested for crime against property will be youths under 21 years of age. The rate of juvenile arrests is growing $2\frac{1}{2}$ times faster than the rate of population growth in this age classification.

Crime does not pay—although a few hoodlums make temporary financial profits. But crime certainly does cost.

Organizations such as yours lead the counterattack against this national menace. The first line of defense against the criminal is the man with the badge who walks the beat or cruises in a patrol car; the sheriffs and officers and policemen who face the gunman, the burglar, and the mugger and at times give their lives in defense of law and order.

ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS DESERVE SUPPORT

You are doing a determined and courageous job, and your ranks are filled with able, dedicated men. But you can't do it all by yourselves. Your efforts are the central ones, but they must derive added strength from other sources. An effective anticrime campaign is one in which America's law enforcement officers represent the link between local civic activity and national coordination. You must have the support and interest of the individual citizens which you are protecting. And your efforts would be greatly enhanced by an exchange of ideas and information between various law enforcement agencies through a national crime commission.

Let's briefly consider these two anticrime elements.

During the hearings before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee in 1950-51, of which I was chairman, we found that the American public was dangerously uninformed and apathetic about the pervasive presence of crime. We met many policemen during our investigations—men who told us of the difficulties they have in enforcing the law because of a lack of support from the law-abiding citizens of their community; men who told us how pressure to obtain special consideration or favors breaks down the whole system of law enforcement.

The ugly facts that splashed across the television set of the Nation served to arouse the American people and rid them of their apathy about the crime problem. The hearings stirred a good deal of anticrime activity in the form of volunteer citizens groups, new crime commissions, tightening of State laws, and congressional legislation.

NEED OF CONSTANT PUBLIC INTEREST

But unfortunately much of this activity, particularly the concern of local citizens, has been sporadic and needs dramatic stim-

ulants. An honest and courageous police officer is priceless even as the children and adults he protects. There may be an occasional bad apple, but the vast majority of our law enforcement population represents America's most dedicated men and women. It is the responsibility of all our citizens to see that our anticrime leaders receive adequate salaries and work in conditions unimpaired by dissension or patronage.

Our law enforcement officers need to be better paid, and they need to have more adequate security when they retire or when they are disabled. Unless we can provide these incentives it is going to be hard to maintain the high caliber of people entrusted with the enforcement of our laws. I think there is a duty on the part of the Federal, State, and local governments in this connection. A great many State and local violations are also violations of Federal statutes. Local law enforcement officers very frequently assist in the enforcement of Federal statutes as well as State laws. Many times they may be killed or disabled while doing so. So I think it is proper that the Federal Government join State and local communities in a program of seeing that our law enforcement officers have better protection.

With this in mind I have filed a bill that will extend the provision of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to cover State and local law enforcement officers when they are killed or injured while enforcing any Federal law. The bill provides for payment to the extent of one-third of the amount set forth in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. It is contemplated that the State and local governments would make similar provisions if they have not already done so. I believe that a joint undertaking would help us retain good men and women in the law enforcement service. I believe it is equitable from the viewpoint of the Federal Government. The bill that I have introduced is as follows:

A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to State and local law enforcement officers who are killed or injured while, or as a direct result of, enforcing any Federal law

"Whereas it is in the public interest to coordinate the efforts of the Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in order to improve the enforcement of laws; and

"Whereas many activities which constitute violations of State laws also constitute violations of Federal laws; and

"Whereas State and local law enforcement officers frequently assist in the enforcement of Federal criminal statutes; and

"Whereas State and local law enforcement officers and their families frequently are not adequately protected in the event any such officer is killed or injured and disabled while engaged in the enforcement of laws; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the Congress that the Federal Government contribute toward the provision of a more adequate measure of protection for State and local law enforcement officers and their families in cases where any such officer is killed or injured and disabled while engaged in enforcing any Federal law: Therefore

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a), except as otherwise provided by section 2, the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, shall apply in the case of any State law enforcement officer (as defined in subsection (b)) who is killed or injured while engaged in, or as a direct result of having engaged in, the enforcement of any Federal law in like manner as if such law enforcement officer were an "employee" as defined in section 40(b) of such Act.

"(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term 'State law enforcement officer' means any sheriff, deputy sheriff, policeman, constable, town marshal, or other officer or employee of any State or political subdivision thereof who is authorized to apprehend and arrest criminals and who is charged with the duty of suppressing criminal activity, apprehending criminals and persons suspected of crimes, preserving the peace, and protecting life and property.

"Sec. 2. The amount of any compensation payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by reason of the provisions of this Act shall be equal to one-third of the amount which would be payable if the individual to whom or on whose account such compensation is payable were an 'employee' as defined in section 40(b) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended."

While crime is largely a local problem there is much that can be done nationally to assist our law enforcement agents. Since our investigations in 1950-51 Congress has passed many bills dealing with various types of criminal activity. This legislation, while beneficial, generally can deal only with specific types and certain manifestations of crime. It cannot strike mortal blows at the broad evil that only occasionally hits the headlines, but usually is carried on quietly down the street.

NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION

Toward this end, I am planning to introduce again in the Senate a bill to establish a National Crime Commission. This Commission, similar to the ones I've proposed in past sessions of Congress, would act as a clearinghouse for the various Federal agencies and anticrime organizations spread throughout the country. It would not interfere with the fine work of the FBI but would supplement it.

It would study the manner and extent to which organized crime uses the facilities of interstate commerce, and evaluate the adequacy of Federal laws dealing with this problem. The Commission would submit recommendations based on its findings, coordinate the activities of various law enforcement agencies, and expedite exchange of information between such groups.

I believe such an organization would provide elements that are often missing from our anticrime movements: unity and permanence. The unity would be supplied by the organizations' coordination of anticrime efforts and cross-ventilation of ideas and techniques. The permanence would come from its continuing presence as a source of information and a sponsor of new programs.

Local encouragement and national cooperation—these are the elements that have been largely absent in past campaigns against crime. In the past 8 years there have been significant improvements along these lines. Present crime rates show clearly that there is much more to be done.

Award of Paul Bunyan Award to Senators Capehart and Sparkman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and I were honored by the Lumbermen's For-

est in Israel, an organization in Pennsylvania consisting of people directly or indirectly concerned with home building. This organization honored Senator CAPEHART and me by giving to each of us the Paul Bunyan annual award. The award was made to each of us according to the wording of the plaque "in recognition of his foresight and unrelenting effort in sponsoring legislation for a progressive housing policy aiming to provide the finest housing in the world for the American people." I deemed it a great honor and I am sure that the same was true for Senator CAPEHART.

On that occasion I made a brief talk. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator CAPEHART, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am overwhelmed by your courtesy in doing me this great honor. I think that even Paul Bunyan himself would have been impressed with the dimensions of your generosity.

It is fitting that there should be events, such as this, celebrated in the name of Paul Bunyan. His name is symbolic of the resilience and audacity of a frontier society. This frontier spirit is well expressed by Carl Sandburg when he says that—

"The people will live on.

The learning and blundering people will live on.

They will be tricked and sold and again sold

And go back to the nourishing earth for rootholds,

The people so peculiar in renewal and comeback,

You can't laugh off their capacity to take it."

Daniel G. Hoffman quotes those few lines from Sandburg and observes that the poet finds in the Bunyan stories, "conquests of terror by laughter, of despair by comic ingenuity, and the victory of the indomitable human spirit over adversity."

No task was too great for Paul Bunyan, nor for the indomitable people who created his legend, nor for the people who came after him—both here and in freedom-loving lands abroad.

I wish that we had a Paul Bunyan to take over the task of housing the American people. This is a task which will require all our talents and all our determination.

According to the Bureau of the Census, in 1957 13 million homes in this Nation were substandard—this represents 24 percent, or 1 out of 4 of the 55,340,000 dwelling units in the continental United States. In 1950, the Census Bureau reported 16 million substandard dwelling units, so that in those 7 years we made some progress, but very little indeed when one considers the high level of prosperity during the period.

Why is this?

The simple answer is that we are not producing enough housing units to meet the need. We are not adding enough new units to force abandonment of many existing units which are worn out and have long ago ceased to be fit for human occupancy.

The formation of new nonfarm households over the past few years has amounted to about 1 million units per year. Housing starts, according to the Bureau of Labor statistics, have been a little over 1 million units per year. This is just enough to take care of new household formation.

We must increase production of housing in the future. We have a dual job. First,

to produce enough new units to accommodate the big family formation expansion expected to take place in the mid-1960's; and second, to replace the old, wornout, and dilapidated units still occupied.

The babies of the midforties will be the new heads of households of the midsixties, so it requires only simple arithmetic to estimate the probable new family formation for that period. In addition to the need to build enough units to meet the requirements of new household formation and to replace existing substandard units, there is an ever-present demand for improvement in the quality of housing consistent with our existing standard of living.

The construction of homes priced to meet the growing needs of larger families is another pressure for expansion of housing construction.

With all these demand factors in mind, we have some rough idea of the job ahead of us. With the right product and the right price, housing production of the mid-1960's could easily double that produced today.

The question is—Can it be done? Do we have the tools to produce housing units within the next 10 years at a rate double the present performance?

I know what Paul Bunyan's answer would be—and my answer is the same. We can produce as much housing as we are willing to produce—and we should never rest until every family in this Nation has a decent home in a suitable living environment.

It is also fitting that Paul Bunyan should be a symbol for your efforts to encourage land reclamation and the development of forests in Israel. For Israel is indeed a frontier, even as our own land was—not so many years ago. Perhaps this work you do through your committee is in partial fulfillment of God's word, when He spoke through Isaiah to say:

"I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water.

"I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together."

You in this assembly, and others all over the country, are helping Israel survive under difficulties almost beyond imagination. Israel is an area no larger than the State of Massachusetts, bordered on three sides by unfriendly nations, and suffering from a minimum of natural and climatic resources. We are helping this tiny nation to remain a lamp of freedom, in a part of the world besieged by Communist pressures, in spite of the many handicaps her people face.

What has already been accomplished toward making Israel economically independent is almost unbelievable.

Land under cultivation increased from 400,000 acres in 1949 to 950,000 in 1957. To restore these vast areas to fruitfulness was in many instances a matter of digging stones out of rough terrain by hand. Most of it was done, however, by modern agricultural equipment supplied in large part by help from people in the United States.

In a great program of reforestation in which your organization has played such an important part there have been planted 27,585,000 trees.

Even with this tremendous development of her land resources Israel supplies only about 70 percent of her overall agricultural needs.

Industrial production has increased by more than 300 percent since 1949. Productivity per worker has risen about 50 percent.

This greater industrial production gave a needed boost to Israel's exports, which quadrupled during the decade. Exports totaled \$200 million in 1957, and reached \$250 million last year.

All this was achieved despite a crippling security burden, an Arab boycott, and the absorption of 900,000 immigrants.

We Americans, it seems to me, must assume these fundamental facts about Israel:

1. It is a reality. It is idle to argue whether or not there should be a country such as Israel.

2. The United States had a leading part in the establishment and recognition of Israel as a free and independent country. It cannot, and will not, stand idly by and see Israel destroyed.

3. Perhaps most important of all, despite the initial hardships and difficulties which this new little State has encountered and despite the efforts of the Communists to entice Israel into their orbit, Israel has stood firm for freedom in the great struggle of this mid-20th century.

To Israel we say: "We cherish your freedom and we intend to do what we can to keep you free."

It is imperative that we renew this assurance from time to time. We need to do so to make crystal clear to Russia and to others that we will live up to the moral obligation that we incurred when we helped to establish that little country.

By patience, tolerance, perseverance, and vigilance in the protection of individual freedom, Israel can serve to lead others to democracy and its many advantages.

It is encouraging that you are doing your bit in working for continued economic development and prosperity in that area.

Let me thank you again for this occasion and this opportunity to be with you. I wish you every success in your great work.

Excerpts From Speech by Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, at His 37th Annual Orchard Picnic, Berryville, Va., Saturday, August 29, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 29, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, senior Senator from Virginia, gave his 37th annual orchard picnic at Berryville, Va. Senator BYRD is so widely known, respected, and beloved by the people that I will not go into his many accomplishments but simply state that he is Virginia's first citizen and one of the outstanding statesmen of America. At the picnic, as has been the custom in the past, Senator BYRD delivered a most enlightening and cogent speech on the events of interest to our people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Senator BYRD's speech:

One of the main topics of conversation in Washington is the approaching visit of Khrushchev. The Congress appears to be divided as to the wisdom of his visit. It has its minus side as well as its plus side. Should one of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have come to America because of the cruelty of Communist Russia take a shot at Khrushchev, it might start a third world war. Such risks as this, in my opinion, outweigh the plus side of his visit.

I am one of those Senators who do not believe he should be invited to address a joint session of the Congress of the United States.

That is the supreme honor accorded only to those we can trust and those who are our friends, such as Winston Churchill. Should a resolution inviting him be presented, and I hope it will not be, I will consider it my duty to vote against it. I am not willing for the Congress officially to pay tribute to the world's greatest Communist and our most dangerous enemy by inviting him to speak formally to the Congress of the United States.

We all know that we must live in the same world with those who ideas differ from ours, and with nations which have different forms of government. But in the case of Russia, let us always remember that Russia is a totalitarian nation, controlled by one man who recognizes only brute strength.

Let us greet Mr. Khrushchev with courtesy, let us protect him in every way possible, but do not let him or any other Russian lead us into a sense of false security. And above all do not let him sell us a bill of goods.

We must keep our military strength equal to if not greater than Russia's. This is our only protection. The Russians equal or excel us in the field of rockets. They definitely excel us in submarines equipped with nuclear weapons, but we excel them in the air and on the sea and in the development of atomic weapons.

It is tragic that after World War II we should find it necessary to prepare ourselves against attack by a formidable nation whose leader appears to be bent on extending his frontiers and control over weaker nations wherever he can find them. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I tell you we must not let our guard down.

As has been my custom, I will give you a Byrd's eye view of the work of the Congress and elsewhere in the Government this year. I shall not go into detail because much has happened since our last meeting.

THE WARREN SUPREME COURT

I call the present Supreme Court the Warren court so as to distinguish it from those courts on which great Justices previously have served our country so honorably and well and with such distinction and dedication to our principles.

The Warren court continues to run true to form, continues to render decision after decision in defiance of constitutional democracy, which, in the brief space of about 180 years, has made America the greatest of all nations.

America has only one-sixth of the population of the world, one-seventh of the earth's surface, but produces one-third of all the world's goods. This is because of our competitive enterprise system and the freedoms of our people.

The Warren court hands down decisions on Mondays. Nearly every Monday when the Court is in session is a Black Monday.

I will not go over the ground which I covered here a year ago when I listed the decisions of the Warren court since 1954. Beginning with the integration decision, these Warren court decisions have steadily weakened our democracy.

This school decision is perhaps the most iniquitous and infamous of all. It was not based upon law nor was it based upon the Constitution, as many distinguished lawyers have so often said.

Since I spoke to you last, the Warren court has rendered three more particularly vicious decisions:

One to search a man's house without a warrant.

Even under the despotic rule of the early English kings a man's home was his castle,

and no one could enter without due process of law.

Another decision would destroy the right of States to control and protect their citizens from indecency and immorality in books and pictures.

The third was a decision to permit the States to tax interstate commerce, which is in violation of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

It happens that I have two distinctions, although some may think they are not too creditable. One is that I am the only Member of the Senate now who voted against the Wagner Labor Act in 1935 which gave special privileges to the labor unions.

The second distinction is that I am the only Member of the Senate now who opposed the Tennessee Valley Authority.

These votes represent my philosophy of government. I do not believe in special privileges for either labor or business. I believe in the private enterprise system which is the source of our progress and advancement.

The Senate labor bill was a weak bill. I did all I could to strengthen it. The House labor bill is strong. It not only gives protection to the membership of the unions, but also controls secondary boycotts, hot cargoes, and such things which can destroy businesses not directly involved in any strike.

The House bill has strong provisions to prevent the intimidation of workers by means of picketing. Virginia is fortunate in that during the administration of Gov. William M. Tuck workers were guaranteed the right to work and are protected against violence and interference by pickets or otherwise.

The new Federal labor bill is now in conference where the differences between the House and the Senate bills are being worked out. Labor legislation must not be unfair to labor, but the excesses of ruthless labor leaders must be curbed. Only Congress has the power to do this.

James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, inadvertently gave an assist to the passage of the stronger House bill when he wrote to each Member of Congress threatening to defeat every Senator and Congressman who voted for the bill.

PRINCE EDWARD

Before I conclude let me mention that ordinarily public schools next week would be reopening all over the State. But this year not a public school in Prince Edward County will open. Never before in the history of public schools in Virginia or any other State has a whole county withdrawn from the public education system.

It is vital, I think, that we in Virginia and people everywhere in America understand the conditions that brought about this closing of all public schools in an entire county.

In 1951 a suit was instituted against Prince Edward County in Virginia and Clarendon County, S.C., to require school integration. In 1954 the Warren court rendered a decision directed at these two counties imposing integration in all public schools with deliberate speed.

The great and able Virginia judge, Sterling Hutcheson, in a memorable decision, found deliberate speed in the case of Prince Edward to be at least 6 to 7 years.

The leaders of the NAACP then took an appeal, although they were urged not to do so by many of those who favored the Warren Supreme Court decision. Then the Federal Court of Appeals overruled Judge Hutcheson and ordered the Prince Edward schools to be integrated in the school year beginning next week. Thus, the county of Prince Edward faced massive integration. Such an enforced integration means the destruction of the public schools in that county.

There are 1780 colored pupils in Prince Edward and 1562 white pupils. The people of Prince Edward were prepared. They had determined when the suit was first instituted against them 8 years ago that they would resist forced integration. They did this in order to preserve a system of education because they knew white students would not attend integrated schools.

It is significant that although Clarendon County, S.C., was the other defendant in the suit, no effort has been made by the NAACP to integrate in that county.

The people of Prince Edward made no threats, they issued no inflammatory statements. There was no violence and no disorder. They have calmly and deliberately established a new system of private education without the use of a single public-school facility, buildings, schoolbuses, or any other public-school equipment.

Every white student in the county will go to school, using completely nonpublic facilities. The parents of the colored students have not attempted to avail themselves of other means of education.

In order to comply with the decision of Chief Justice Taft, rendered in 1928, providing for equal but separate school facilities, Prince Edward expended \$1 million on a colored high school building. Prince Edward still owes \$400,000 on this school. It will be closed. The blame for this situation must be placed directly upon the ruthless action of the NAACP.

The colored people of Prince Edward County have been the victims of their leaders. Their lack of education must be laid directly at the door of those NAACP leaders who have become the integration enforcement agents for the Warren court.

Since the NAACP is responsible for closing the Negro schools in Prince Edward it would be appropriate for this association to allocate a part of its large tax exempt income to aid the Negroes in this county to obtain an education. In doing this the NAACP could in part make atonement for the injury they have done to these members of their race.

Knowing the people of Prince Edward as I do, I am confident that they are prepared to do everything within their power to give the colored students of Prince Edward the same education they have had in the past in segregated schools.

The NAACP has won its lawsuits and the Negroes have lost their schools, operated 85 percent at the expense of the white people of Prince Edward.

It is a tragedy for everyone—all because the NAACP deliberately and maliciously forced this action upon Prince Edward. Prince Edward has taken the only action it could take. The county had sought by every honorable means to avoid this step. It was faced with the destruction of its school system. White parents had taxed themselves heavily to build new Negro schools, and the Negroes had as many classrooms as the whites—Negro schoolteachers were paid exactly the same as the white.

The action that Prince Edward has taken is courageous, and it was thoughtfully and well considered. The brave citizens of Prince Edward are true to the faith of their fathers.

Those who expressed confidence in the so-called moderation of the NAACP which is enforcing the integration laws should not only take note of this ruthless action taken against Prince Edward, but they should note the recent statement by the NAACP spokesman, Roy Wilkins, which has great significance.

"With the collapse of massive resistance laws," declares Roy Wilkins, national executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "the

South is trying to adopt a token compliance policy to get around the 1954 Supreme Court decision. Generally," he adds, "we are opposed to any form of token integration on the grounds that it is contrary to the Court's decision, but the NAACP will go along with plans where it appears to be a bona fide start toward desegregation."

Note that Wilkins accepts token integration only as a "bona fide start toward desegregation." Desegregation means massive integration.

I and other Virginians who advocated massive resistance to the illegal school integration decision of the Warren court have been bitterly denounced, chiefly by those outside of Virginia.

I stand now as I stood when I first urged massive resistance.

I believe then as I believe now that it is either massive resistance or in the long run

run massive integration, and this would destroy our entire school system.

As one who has been honored so often by the Virginia people I felt my duty was to give the best advice of which I was capable.

At least under the massive resistance program Virginia remained segregated for 5 years after the Warren decision, notwithstanding the fact that massive efforts of the Federal Government and the NAACP were directed at Virginia alone.

Due to the concentration of all power against us today Virginia is the only Southern State having enforced integration.

The policy was to break Virginia down first, and now the unholy alliance of the NAACP and the Federal Government will attempt the same strong-arm methods throughout the South.

I am firmly convinced that as long as the NAACP is in the driver's seat, the goal is massive integration all down the line in all walks of life.

Just a few weeks ago the NAACP met in New York City in annual convention and were addressed by so-called political notables.

A resolution was adopted declaring for complete integration of the races in all areas, effective on the 100th anniversary of the signing by Lincoln of the proclamation for the emancipation of the slaves. This program naturally includes declaring unconstitutional all State laws prohibiting mixed marriages.

If Warren lives long enough and remains on the Court this decision will certainly be rendered. It is not necessary for me to forecast the calamitous results of massive integration accompanied by legal encouragement toward mixed marriages.

SENATE

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1959

(Legislative day of Monday, August 31, 1959)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save: Amid all the confusion and bafflement of these days, we pray by Thy sustaining grace that our minds may be kept clear and clean and uncluttered by prejudice.

Lord, in this hour of tumult;
Lord, in this night of fears;
Keep open, O keep open
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears
In this sacred temple of the Republic's
life,
Not blindly nor in hatred,
Lord let us do our part.
Keep open, O keep open, dear Lord,
Our eyes, our mind, our heart.

Amen.

REQUESTS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering the housing bill, be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it may be necessary to recess the Senate, in order to permit committees to meet, to transact the public business. I hope that will not be necessary; but I want all Members to be on notice that it may be necessary. I trust that the 90-odd Members who indicated that they were willing, ready, and anxious to work to complete the job which we were

elected to do will be here to support that position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee, which has under consideration the bill on the interest rate ceiling on E bonds and H bonds, may be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 934, House bill 8678.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8678) to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8678) to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments; and subsequently had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with additional amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to consider the bill was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice to the Senate that we expect to have a late session this evening. It may continue until as late

as midnight, at least. We are hopeful that the Senate will be able today to pass the very important Federal-aid-to-highways bill.

We received complete cooperation from all the members of the two Senate committees yesterday; and I particularly wish to express the appreciation of the Senate and, I believe, of the country, to the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the very able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the very able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and to other Senators who had proposals in which they were interested. They realize the importance of this bill; and they also realize that with each day that passes, the country is losing taxes it will need in order to make the highway program a success.

As a result of their diligence and the diligence of the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], we were able—notwithstanding the fact that it was necessary for the Senate to be in recess—to get that important piece of proposed legislation reported.

Each Member will have a chance to say what he wishes to say on that measure, today; and a little later I will propose a unanimous-consent request for a limitation of time, so that Members who may desire to be away from the Chamber may know when to expect votes.

But at the moment—

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator from Texas knows that a very controversial amendment, an amendment which relates to billboards, which was approved yesterday by the Public Works Committee, is in the highway bill; and millions of people throughout the country are very much concerned about that provision.

I hope the distinguished majority leader will not seek to limit time on this important question, about which few Members know anything; they have no idea of what the effects will be on their individual States. I believe widespread resentment would result if we were to act on this proposal too precipitately.